

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 9, 2008. Claims 54-56, 73, 84, 85, 89, 104, and 107 have been amended. Claims 133-143 have been added. Therefore, claims 54-143 are pending in this case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Specification Objections

Applicant traverses the objection for at least the reasons presented in the previous Office Action response (which Applicant hereby incorporates by reference). Additionally, Applicant has amended the specification to include “The computer program product may be embodied on a computer usable medium and include program logic”, which is supported at least by original claims 11-13.

Amendments

Applicant has amended the claims to indicate that the first account is independent from the second account. Applicant submits that the originally submitted specification supports this terminology as the various accounts and users (e.g., of various groups, families and otherwise) are described as being independent of one another (although they may be related by being in the same groups or allowing the sharing of information). See, for example, paragraphs [0027], [0066], [0146]-[0149], and [0162]-[0167] of the published version of this Application (2002/0023230). Applicant respectfully submits that the independent nature of these accounts clearly distinguishes (and is described differently than) from the “subaccounts” described in Star. The deficiencies of the cited references are addressed in more detail below.

103 Rejections

Claims 54, 56-59, 61-64, 66-72, 112, 113, 118, and 119 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn (U.S. Patent Number 6,862,612,

“Horn”) in view of Star (U.S. Publication Number 2002/0062270, “Star”) and Szabo (U.S. Publication Number 2007/0156677, “Szabo”).

Claims 55, 73-76, 78-80, 82-89, 92-97, 100-111, 115, 116, 121, 122, 124, 125, 127, 128, 130, and 131 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star in view of Szabo. Applicant traverses the rejections below.

Regarding claim 54, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Horn fail to teach or suggest **sending, via a public network, a first set of information identifying a plurality of business entities to an information distribution service, wherein said first set of information is received via a first account of the information distribution service that is associated with a first user, and wherein said first set of information is usable by the information distribution service to associate said plurality of business entities with said first account, wherein said associating permits the plurality of business entities to provide content that is accessible via the first account of the information distribution service.** The Office Action specifically relies on Horn, column 3, lines 60-67. The cited portions, and Horn in general, relates to maintaining customer profile information across a plurality of websites, e.g., in response to an “express buy” request by the customer. In the descriptions of Horn, a different website may identify and use the customer profile information (e.g., in response to the request) which may be stored in a central location. Thus, Horn addresses the problem where a user must enter the same profile information (e.g., payment and shipping information) for a plurality of different websites by consolidating that information, e.g., in a dictionary of customer profiles (See columns 3 and 4). Applicant respectfully submits that this is different (and not particularly related to) an information distribution service that receives an identification of businesses for association with a first user so that the business entity content is accessible via the first account of the information distribution service. More specifically, Horn allows the customer profile information to be available to a plurality of servers while the claim requires that associates a plurality of business entities with an account so that content from the business entities are accessible via the first account of the user.

Moreover, the teachings of Horn do not appear to be relevant to the claim language of the entire claim of 54, which relates to an information distribution service that may allow for sharing control information among a plurality of users (including the first and second users) as well as provision of business information to the first user of the information distribution service.

With further regard to claim 54, the cited references fail to teach or suggest **providing sharing control information to said information distribution service via said public network, wherein said sharing control information is received via said first account and specifies other accounts of said information distribution service that are permitted to access specified personal information associated with said first account, and wherein said first account is independent from said other accounts.**

With respect to the previous version of this feature, the Office Action relies on the subaccounts of Star, more specifically, paragraphs [0027] and [0009]. These paragraphs describe that a small business owner may have an account for his managing various financial transactions across a plurality of different financial accounts. The business account may include a root account, which has full access, and may further include (e.g., at the user's request) various subaccounts that have varying degrees of accessibility / write privileges. For example, one of the subaccounts may be for a payroll employee or department which may be allowed to employ payroll, but may be prevented from accessing the CMA account for general check writing privileges. Paragraph [0027] includes further examples. Thus, Star allows an account to have a plurality of subaccounts in order for a business owner to delegate financial duties in an integrated manner while still only allowing appropriate access. Applicant respectfully submits that the subaccounts of the single account (for a single business) is different than the provision of sharing control information to the information distribution service where the first account is independent from the other user accounts. The account and subaccount relationship of Star is clearly different than the independent relationship of the first account and the other user accounts. Stated another way, a subaccount is not independent from its parent account. Thus, Horn in view of Star and Szabo fail to teach this feature of claim 54. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that Horn,

Star, and Szabo, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach all the features of claim 54, and so Applicant submits that claim 54 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Regarding claim 56, similar to reasons provided above, Star in view of Szabo fails to teach or suggest **wherein the received messages further include a third message, wherein said third message includes information corresponding to a second account of said information distribution service, and wherein the second account corresponds to a second user of said information distribution service, wherein the second account has been associated with the first account, and wherein said first account is independent from said second account.** Star and Szabo do not teach or suggest both messages from business entities as well as messages corresponding to a second user account of the information distribution service (which is independent from the first user account).

With further regard to claim 56, Star in view of Szabo fails to teach or suggest **wherein the one or more application servers are configured to generate a report for the first account by selecting the stored messages that are directed to the first account and whose time-based priorities satisfy one or more time-based criteria, wherein the report for the first account includes at least an indication of the first, second, and third messages.** There is no indication of a report which includes messages from business entities as well as messages corresponding to a second user account of the information distribution service in the cited references. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that Horn, Star, and Szabo, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach all the features of claim 56, and so Applicant submits that claim 56 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Similar remarks apply to claims 55, 73, 84, 85, 104, and 139.

Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION:

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-71800/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2008

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847